

REMARKS

In the parent case of this RCE case, the Examiner made a final rejection of claims 2-9, 11 and 14 on grounds that claims 2-9, 11 and 14 fail to comply with the description requirement. The Examiner bases this rejection on the fact that the original disclosure does not allegedly teach collocation of the firewall device and the wireless data terminal. Only claims amended claim 11 and new claim 14 recite the collocation limitation, and claims 2-9 depend from claim 11, but do not recite this limitation themselves.

In response to this rejection, claims 2-9 have not been amended, but claims 11 and 14 have been amended. Claim 11 has been amended to recite that the firewall device (more specifically, the wireless communication interface module thereof) is directly connected to the wireless communication device (which previously was recited to be collocated) such that a direct communication is established between the firewall device and the remote wireless terminal without accessing a full management station managing a plurality of firewalls.

Win et al. fails to teach a network management equipment comprising a wireless communication device directly connected to a firewall device to establish direct communication between the firewall device and a remote wireless terminal and a limited management interface without accessing a full management station managing a plurality of firewalls as recited in claims 11 and 14.

Win et al. fails to disclose a firewall device comprising a security application and a full management interface which comprises mechanisms for conducting management operations for said network security application of the firewall device over a secure data connection from a full management station managing a plurality of firewall devices.

Win also fails to teach a firewall device comprising a limited management user interface for conducting limited number of management operations of the full management user interface for the network security application of the firewall device.

Win further fails to teach that a firewall device comprising a wireless communication interface module is directly connected to a wireless communication device through which the wireless remote connection is established.

As noted previously, Win discloses a method for secure user access to authorized web resources, based upon the user's role in the organization that controls the web resources. The access is provided and managed by an access server and a registry server that manages access to administration information about user resources and roles of the users.

Win et al. does not disclose management of a firewall.

In section 7 of the Final Action, the Examiner alleges that Win teaches to the management of any node in the network architecture, including the firewall. However, the Examiner fails to show where such teaching is made in Win. According to Win, the access server and a registry server manage and control a secure user access to authorized web resources, i.e., web servers. Win does not teach a management of any node.

The Examiner admits that Win fails to teach maintaining a limited user interface within a managed device, such as a firewall. The Examiner alleges that McGrane discloses maintaining a limited user interface within a managed device, such as a firewall.

As we have noted before, McGrane relates to totally different technical field, namely to an arrangement for controlling domestic entertainment

83 electronics by an infra-red control unit. There would have been no motivation to
84 apply teachings of McGrane, which relates to domestic entertainment electronics,
85 to the system of Win et al., which relates to management of access to web
86 resources.

87 Moreover, even if a person skilled in the art would have considered
88 McGrane, the skilled person would not have achieved the present invention as
89 claimed. In McGrane, the IR controller sends IR signals to a centralized control
90 unit which responds to these IR signals by sending commands to respectiv ones
91 of a plurality of controlled devices. Thus, each controlled device has a single
92 wired control interface to the centralized control unit.

93 If a person skilled in the art had attempted to apply this teaching in Win,
94 he/she would have controlled the access server and/or registry server by an IR
95 controller. The skilled person would not have directly controlled the web servers
96 or any other device in the network.

97 Thus, Win in view of McGrane teaches away from the present invention.

98 Based upon this reasoning, Claims 11 and 14 are not obvious from Win et
99 al. in view of McGrane.

100 Claims 2 – 9 are dependent upon claim 11, and are therefore also
101 patentable.

102
103
104
105
106
107 Dated: July 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Craig Fish
Reg. No. 28,843
Tel 408 866 4777

112 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail,
113 postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents , P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450.
114 on
115 2/12/07
116 (Date of Deposit)
117

118 
119

120 Ronald Craig Fish, President
121 Ronald Craig Fish, a Law Corporation

122 Reg. No. 28,843
123